

Serial No.: 09/850,370  
Case No.: 19892DB  
Page No.: 5

REMARKS

The Official Action of August 1, 2001, and the references cited therein have been carefully considered. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In the interest of compact prosecution Claims 1-13 have been canceled without prejudice and new Claims 21-39 have been added to be directed to specific aspects of the claimed invention. Support for new Claims 21-39 is found, e.g. on page 7, lines 6-15, page 8, lines 11-12, page 11, lines 3-13, page 52, line 9, to page 53, line 5 and in the claims of the application as filed.

Claims 21-39 are pending in the application.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-13 for Obviousness-type Double Patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,096,742


Claims 1-13 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,742 (which issued from the grandparent application to the present divisional application). Although the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in the interest of compact prosecution such claims have been canceled without prejudice. In this regard, Applicants note that new Claims 21-39 are patentably distinct from Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,742 because they are directed to specific depressive or anxiety disorders.

Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,742 should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 09/850,370  
Case No.: 19892DB  
Page No.: 6

Applicants respectfully contend that the application is allowable and a favorable response from the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
J. Eric Thies  
Reg. No. 35,382  
Attorney for Applicant

MERCK & CO., Inc.  
P.O. Box 2000  
Rahway, New Jersey 07065-0907  
(908) 594-3904

Date: November 30, 2001